



MINUTES

HUNTINGTON BEACH PLANNING COMMISSION

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 8, 2005

HUNTINGTON BEACH CIVIC CENTER

2000 MAIN STREET, HUNTINGTON BEACH, CALIFORNIA 92648

4:30 P.M. - ROOM B-8 (CITY HALL LOWER LEVEL)

CALL PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING TO ORDER

ROLL CALL: *A* *P* *P* *P* *P* *P* *P*
Dwyer, Scandura, Dingwall, Ray, Livengood, Burnett, Fuhrman
Commissioner Livengood arrived at 5:00 p.m.

AGENDA APPROVAL

A MOTION WAS MADE BY DINGWALL, SECONDED BY SCANDURA, TO APPROVE THE PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING AGENDA OF FEBRUARY 8, 2005 BY THE FOLLOWING VOTE:

AYES: Scandura, Dingwall, Ray, Burnett, Fuhrman
NOES: None
ABSENT: Dwyer, Livengood
ABSTAIN: None

MOTION APPROVED

A. STUDY SESSION ITEMS

A-1. INTRODUCTION OF STAFF – Herb Fauland

The following Planning Department staff members were introduced to the Commission:

<u>Administration</u>	<u>Code Enforcement</u>	<u>Advance Planning</u>	<u>Current Planning</u>
Robin Lugar	Bill Zylla	Mary Beth Broeren	Herb Fauland
Brian Hatfield	Mike Fuentes	Ricky Ramos	Paul DaVeiga
Judy Demers	Al Brady	Jason Kelley	Ron Santos
Ramona Kohlmann	Rich Massi	Jane James	Rami Talleh
Kathy Schooley	Nancy Blacksher	Rosemary Medel	
	Martha Villasenor		
	Tony Duarte (Absent)		
	Richard Hedden (Absent)		

The following staff members introduced themselves and the department they represent:

Howard Zelefsky, Director of Planning
Leonie Mulvihill, Deputy City Attorney
Terri Elliott, Civil Engineer Principal, Public Works
Eric Engberg, Division Chief/Fire Marshall
Scott Hess, Planning Manager

A-2. PARK AVENUE MARINA – Paul DaVeiga

Paul DaVeiga, Associate Planner, discussed the following key issues related to Coastal Development Permit No. 00-13, Conditional Use Permit No. 00-43 and Mitigated Negative Declaration No. 00-07:

- Site grading/flood plain compliance
- Dredging of channel to provide access to docks
- Public access to coastal amenities
- Compatibility with adjacent single family residential
- Protection of native vegetation and sensitive wildlife habitat
- Access to site from Park Avenue
- City wharfage approval
- Other agency approval – California Coastal Commission, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (401) permit), California Department of Fish and Game (Streambed Alteration Agreement), California State Lands Commission (Recreational Pier License), Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board (Harbor Permit)

Commission questions/comments included:

- Original zoning (Open Space Water Recreation)
- Square footage of Caretakers quarters (2,445 sq. ft.); office (400 sq. ft.)
- Design compatibility with neighboring structures
- California Coastal Commission (CCC) regulations
- Open Park Space
- Public/private parking
- Future ownership and Certificate of Occupancy (C of O) requirements
- Beach access (public/private; Coastal Act Policy)
- Native vegetation/tidal zone landscaping
- 10-foot wide easement
- Wharf rights
- Height requirements

Chair Ray announced that public comments on Study Session items would be heard at the end of the meeting.

A-3. DOWNTOWN PARKING MASTER PLAN ANNUAL REVIEW – Ron Santos

Ron Santos, Assistant Planner, discussed the following key issues related to the annual review of the Downtown Parking Master Plan (DPMP) originally approved in 1995 in conjunction with the Downtown Specific Plan (DTSP) update:

- March 8, 2005 public hearing
- Area description/development
- Review period (June 2003-2004)
- Shared Parking concept
- Documentation of development activity
- Land use changes (Jack's Garage, Poseidon Billiards, Tipsy Gypsy)

Commission questions/comments included:

- Parking deficit (explanation of parking in-lieu fee)

- Parking supply for new development (adequate)
- A-4. BROWN ACT/PROPOSITION 59 – Leonie Mulvihill**

Leonie Mulvihill, Deputy City Attorney, made a presentation to the Commission that outlined the following points of information related to the Brown Act and Proposition 59:

- The Ralph M. Brown Act (1953) – California Government Code Section 54950
- Basic principals
- What is a Brown Act meeting and examples of exceptions
- Serial meetings (meetings with constituents, informal staff briefings, e-mail, Daisy-chain, Hub & spoke, Polling)

Commissioner Dingwall cited numerous scenarios of Commission activity outside of a public meeting in an effort to understand what constitutes a serial meeting and the potential for a Brown Act violation.

Commissioner Fuhrman suggested that the Commission hold their questions and comments until Ms. Mulvihill completes her presentation.

Chair Ray voiced support for the Commission's right to ask questions during the presentation.

Commissioner Livengood suggested taking a vote.

Chair Ray asked for a motion.

A MOTION WAS MADE BY FUHRMAN, SECONDED BY LIVENGOOD, TO HOLD ALL COMMISSION COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS UNTIL THE END OF THE BROWN ACT/PROPOSITION 59 PRESENTATION, BY THE FOLLOWING VOTE:

AYES: Scandura, Livengood, Burnett, Fuhrman
NOES: Ray, Dingwall
ABSENT: Dwyer
ABSTAIN: None

MOTION APPROVED

Chair Ray explained that the Commission may object to the Chair's ruling by majority vote and requested that Ms. Mulvihill continue with her presentation.

- Public notice requirement
- Written agenda requirement
- Closed session matters
- Remedies for Brown Act violations (invalidation, civil action, criminal penalties)
- Standing/Ad Hoc/Sub committees

Commission questions/comments included:

- Email correspondence
- Collective concurrence
- Process of invalidation (time frame, etc.)
- Curing a violation
- Procedural matters/discussions

- Specific jurisdictions of the Commission identified in the City Municipal Code Ms. Mulvihill provided information on Proposition 59 related to the Public Records Act and guarantees the public the right to inspect, receive public records from public agencies. She provided exceptions to the act (financial information, social security numbers, private addresses, telephone numbers, etc.), and explained how cities balance privacy rights and records subject to public disclosure.

Commissioner Livengood suggested that the Chair open public comments prior to continuing with the current topic of discussion. Chair Ray disagreed and asked Ms. Mulvihill to continue.

Commission questions/comments included:

- Writings of public officials open to scrutiny by the public
- Emails to staff (a public record subject to disclosure)

Ms. Mulvihill briefly explained governmental policy on public gifts to family members.

A-5. LEAGUE OF CALIFORNIA CITIES PLANNERS INSTITUTE – Steve Ray

Chair Ray provided information to the new Commissioners on the scope of the Planners Institute and asked that they notify staff of their plans to attend.

Discussion ensued on the Commission's reimbursable expenses, including conference registration, per diem and mileage.

B. AGENDA REVIEW (UPDATE ON ALL AGENDA ITEMS) – Herb Fauland

Herb Fauland identified the items scheduled for public hearing and informed the Commission that no new information was received on either item.

C. PLANNING COMMISSION COMMITTEE REPORTS – None.

D. PUBLIC COMMENTS – Regarding Study Session portion of Meeting

One speaker provided comments on Item No. A-2 (Park Avenue Marina).

6:30 P.M. – RECESS FOR DINNER

7:00 P.M. – COUNCIL CHAMBERS

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

CALL PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING TO ORDER

ROLL CALL: *A* *P* *P* *P* *P* *P* *P*
Dwyer, Scandura, Dingwall, Ray, Livengood, Burnett, Fuhrman

AGENDA APPROVAL

A MOTION WAS MADE BY DINGWALL, SECONDED BY SCANDURA, TO APPROVE THE PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING AGENDA OF FEBRUARY 8, 2005 BY THE FOLLOWING VOTE:

AYES: Scandura, Dingwall, Ray, Livengood, Burnett, Fuhrman
NOES: None
ABSENT: Dwyer
ABSTAIN: None

MOTION APPROVED

A. ORAL COMMUNICATIONS

Paul Cross, Huntington Street, spoke in opposition to Public Hearing Item No. B-2 (Timeshares). He voiced concerns about the City's coastline being a mecca for wealthy overnight visitors, followed by idleness. He suggested that construction projects on Pacific Coast Highway be scaled back, referring to the Hyatt and Waterfront Hilton hotels. He also voiced concerns about the idle sports complex in Huntington Central Park and Old Town's mix of single-family and commercial uses. He requested that the City provide current occupancy rates from the Hyatt and Waterfront Hilton hotels.

Chair Ray informed the speaker that in order for his comments to be made part of the public record he must speak during the public hearing on Item No. B-2 (Timeshares).

Chris Zomaya, Huntington Beach, provided comments about apartment/condominium conversion issues. Staff suggested that the individual contact Scott Hess, Planning Manager on conversions.

B. PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS

- B-1. ANNUAL REVIEW OF THE HOLLY-SEACLIFF DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT (NO. 90-1) COMPLIANCE REPORT** Applicant: City of Huntington Beach
Request: Annual review of the Holly-Seacliff Development Agreement Compliance Report. Location: Approximately 490 acres located between Ellis Avenue on the north, Huntington Street on the east, Edwards Street on the west, and the Seacliff Golf Course on the South. **Project Planner: Mary Beth Broeren**

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Motion to: "Determine that the Developer is in compliance with the Holly Seacliff Development Agreement, approve the 2004 Compliance Report and forward to the City Council for review and acceptance."

Commission disclosures: Commissioners Scandura and Ray spoke with staff.

Mary Beth Broeren, Principal Planner, provided a staff report that included material to support staff's recommendation to accept the annual review as adequate and in compliance with the Holly Seacliff Development Agreement. She discussed project background and analysis and stated that the developer has completed 98% of the improvements identified in the agreement.

Commissioner Fuhrman inquired about completion of Promenade Park. Ms. Broeren discussed the minor improvements scheduled for completion by the end of February 2005.

Chair Ray asked if the outstanding tasks identified in the report should be completed prior to the annual review. Ms. Broeren explained that completion of the outstanding items is not mandatory for publishing the report. She also discussed the goals and provisions of the development agreement including landscape improvements at Promenade Park.

Chair Ray asked if the developer would meet all requirements before the end of the 15-year review period. Ms. Broeren answered yes.

Chair Ray asked if the agreement calls for development of all areas within Holly-Seacliff Specific Plan (HSSP). Ms. Broeren explained that the agreement is not responsible for development of the entire HSSP area, citing examples such as the Chevron property and smaller parcels within the industrial zone. She also stated that the HSSP remains in place when the agreement expires.

Chair Ray asked if discussion has taken place to extend the development agreement. Ms. Broeren answered no.

THE PUBLIC HEARING WAS OPENED:

Bill Holman, PLC, introduced himself and was available for questions. He discussed completion of landscape improvements at Promenade Park and addressed the issue of undeveloped properties within the HSSP area, explaining that property owners are in sole control of developing their property, and that PLC is near completion of the last piece of residential development. He complimented staff and the Commission for their role in development of the HSSP area.

WITH NO ONE ELSE PRESENT TO SPEAK, THE PUBLIC HEARING WAS CLOSED.

A MOTION WAS MADE BY SCANDURA, SECONDED BY LIVENGOOD, TO DETERMINE THAT THE DEVELOPER IS IN COMPLIANCE WITH THE HOLLY SEACLIFF DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT, AND TO APPROVE THE 2004 COMPLIANCE REPORT AND FORWARD TO THE CITY COUNCIL FOR REVIEW AND ACCEPTANCE BY THE FOLLOWING VOTE:

AYES: Scandura, Dingwall, Ray, Livengood, Burnett, Fuhrman
NOES: None
ABSENT: Dwyer
ABSTAIN: None

MOTION PASSED

- B-2. GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT NO. 03-03, LOCAL COASTAL PROGRAM AMENDMENT NO. 03-02, ZONING TEXT AMENDMENT NO. 03-03 (DOWNTOWN SPECIFIC PLAN-TIMESHARES):** Applicant: Robert Mayer Corp., Shawn Millbern Request: To amend the Huntington Beach General Plan Land Use Element, Huntington Beach Coastal Element (Local Coastal Program), and Downtown Specific Plan (DTSP) to permit "timeshares" as an allowed use subject to a conditional use permit from the Planning Commission within District 7

(Visitor-Serving Commercial) and District 9 (Commercial Recreation) of the Downtown Specific Plan. Location: Downtown Specific Plan District 7 & 9 Commercial Visitor District (north side of Pacific Coast Highway between Beach Blvd. and First Street.) **Project Planner: Rosemary Medel**

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Motion to: A) "Recommend approval of General Plan Amendment No. 03-03 by approving the draft Resolution and forward to the City Council for adoption;" B) "Recommend approval of Zoning Text Amendment No. 03-03 with findings by approving the draft Ordinances and forward to the City Council for adoption;" and C) "Recommend approval of Local Coastal Program Amendment No. 03-02 with findings by approving the draft Resolution and forward to the City Council for adoption."

Commission disclosures: Commissioner Burnett drove the site, Commissioner Fuhrman spoke with staff, Commissioner Scandura spoke with staff and Council Member Coerper, and Chair Ray visited the site and spoke with staff.

Rosemary Medel, Associate Planner, provided a PowerPoint presentation and staff report to the Commission with information on analysis compatibility, parking demand, coastal and economic issues, Master Plan concept, general timeshare characteristics and Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT).

Commission questions/comments:

- Tax distribution identified on Attachment 12 - Comparison of Revenues Generated On-Site (General Fund vs. Redevelopment Agency); tax percentages (property, sales, transient occupancy)
- Timeshare ownership (requirements, maintenance, property valuation, deed recording, rental options)
- TOT levy on timeshares
- Room sharing by Districts 7 and 9 hotels to meet occupancy rate (OCR) requirements by the California Coastal Commission (CCC)
- Timeshare benefits and visitor accommodating uses
- Land use decisions as a Master Plan concept
- Differences in timeshare definitions within the Downtown Specific Plan and Huntington Beach Zoning and Subdivision Ordinance (HBZSO)
- Land use compatibility
- Spending projections and comparisons between timeshare and hotel stays (days versus weeks); prepaid occupancy
- Valuation figures from the County Assessors Office (worldwide; county)
- Timeshare parking demand (hotel/motel 1.1 ratio applies)
- Discussions on timeshares held between the City and Makar Properties
- Timeshare OCR's provided by the Marriott Corporation versus industry standards (90% to 20%)
- Master Plan development percentage rates for Districts 7 and 9 (Mayer Corporation/Makar Properties)
- Timeshare conversion standards within the Commercial General zone
- Discussion on the third hotel identified in the Master Plan Concept for District 9

THE PUBLIC HEARING WAS OPENED:

Shawn Millbern, Mayer Corporation, spoke in support of the zone change to allow timeshares and underscored additional options for development of hospitality uses. He

discussed the skyrocketing prices for hotel use and how timeshare sales provide a return on the developer's investments. He stated that timeshare visitors stay longer and spend more money than traditional hotel guests. He called timeshares a modern trend in the hospitality industry.

Mr. Millbern stated that Huntington Beach has a reasonable supply of hotels, as identified in the analysis submitted by PKF Consulting. He also discussed coastal communities included in the report that have similar development limitations such as the cities of Santa Barbara and Carmel.

Chair Ray asked why the PKF Study listed Huntington Beach and Sunset Beach together when the City collects no revenue from Sunset Beach hotels. Mr. Millbern replied that it was possible that visitors to the Huntington Beach area could stay in Sunset Beach, however because there are comparatively few accommodations in Sunset Beach the information was inconsequential to the conclusions of the study.

Mr. Millbern compared visitor hotels to timeshares and discussed typical hotel stays as an expensive, 2 to 3 day trip. He explained that hotel visitors and corporate groups for businesses tend to dine in the hotel and don't venture out into the community, and that individuals who use timeshares spend more leisure time dining, shopping and visiting the local community for a longer period of time. He stated that the average timeshare visitor spends \$1000 per week. He also stated that the hotel business is cyclical, and that timeshares are pre-picked and pre-sold with an even supply of visitors.

Mr. Millbern discussed major hotel chains such as the Marriott Corporation with a 90% OCR. Commissioner Fuhrman asked if the Mayer Corporation was expecting a 90% OCR. Mr. Millbern replied that a 90% OCR would not be expected for hotels, but definitely for a timeshare development at present location.

Mr. Millbern explained property valuation and discussed the potential for revenue generation through timeshares. He also discussed the Mayer Corporation's development agreement that allows for a master plan project, and although it did not specifically address timeshares, it does address hospitality uses.

Commissioner Burnett asked Mr. Millbern to explain "multiplier effect", a phrase identified on page 9.9 of the Timeshare Industry Report 2001 Update by the Economic Development department. Mr. Millbern explained how dollars spent multiply.

Doug Traub, Huntington Beach Conference and Visitors Bureau, spoke in support of the request. He discussed the importance of offering a diversity of products in the city, and the increased revenue that the community would enjoy from a timeshare development. He also discussed how timeshare units for sale are advertised worldwide, and how they contribute to stabilizing retail and restaurant businesses. He said that timeshares would increase quality of life and attract an influx of long-term visitors who will learn about the area's attractions year-round. He also said that timeshares will have a low impact on residential amenities such as parking, and will create jobs.

Ethen Thacher, Makallon Atlanta Huntington Beach, LLC, spoke in support of the item.

WITH NO ONE ELSE PRESENT TO SPEAK, THE PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED.

A MOTION WAS MADE BY LIVENGOD, SECONDED BY SCANDURA, TO APPROVE THE APPLICANT'S REQUEST.

Commissioner Dingwall stated that timeshares would be revenue neutral to the City and positive to Redevelopment Agency. He also voiced concerns about fraud and room sharing to meet OCR requirements by the CCC, suggesting that the Commission consider a condition that prohibits room sharing. Ms. Broeren discussed how both the Mayer Corporation and Redevelopment Agency have monthly reports for revenue generation that serves as a monitoring tool for tax distribution.

Commissioner Scandura discussed the request from a land use perspective, and voiced concerns about the City directing the Mayer Corporation on how to disperse TOT revenue. He also discussed the number of ways to demonstrate that requirements have been met, suggesting that conditions be added to the Conditional Use Permit (CUP) specifying that all entitlements must state how they will meet the 25% OCR requirement.

Commissioner Livengood discussed how timeshares provide diversity among the high number of high-class hotel rooms in the City.

Commissioner Fuhrman voiced concerns about the applicant and their attorneys providing assurance that coastal policy requirements will be lawfully fulfilled. He also voiced concerns about language manipulation under the definition of timeshare provided on Attachment 7. Ms. Broeren explained that the intent of the 25% OCR requirement by the CCC is to ensure that overnight accommodations are available to the general public during high season.

Commissioner Dingwall asked Commissioner Livengood to amend his motion by prohibiting room sharing.

Chair Ray voiced concerns about concept of room sharing should the Mayer Corporation decide to sell existing facilities to separate ownerships. Ms. Broeren explained that timeshares would require a CUP and coastal development permit (CDP) that would include conditions of approval requiring that the 25% OCR be met. She also pointed out how each application has specific scenarios. Chair Ray asked if language outlining OCR requirements could be included in tonight's land use decision. Ms. Broeren replied that future applications would have to comply with Coastal Zone policy and meet the 25% OCR requirement within the downtown specific plan area, Districts 7 and 9.

Ms. Medel suggested that language provided on Attachment 5.3, C.3.2.4 be added as sections 4.9.12 and 4.8.13 on Attachment 3.5. Commissioner Scandura read suggested language.

Commissioner Livengood accepted the suggested modification as part of his motion to approve the request.

Commissioner Dingwall voiced support for the request if the option of room sharing was eliminated.

Chair Ray asked about the results of adding conditions related to future entitlements and land use decisions. Ms. Broeren explained that as part of the coastal document and specific plan, the condition becomes a development standard.

Leonie Mulvihill spoke in favor of duplicating language added to Attachment 3.5 as sections 4.9.12 and 4.9.13 to sections 4.11.07 and 4.11.08 on Attachment 3.6. Ms.

Broeren proposed appropriate language that was approved by Commissioners Livengood and Scandura.

Commissioner Fuhrman voiced concerns about the restrictions associated in providing a definition on timeshares and adding a condition that affects future entitlement opportunities. Ms. Broeren explained that the motion would still allow 25% flexibility within the Master Plan area. Commissioner Livengood added that the added condition locks in provisions if split ownership occurs in the future.

Scott Hess stated that staff will modify applicable sections of the Specific Plan and reminded the Commission that the request is a not a project-oriented decision, suggesting that the Commission stay with minor amendments and keep flexible. Chair Ray echoed statements made by Mr. Hess.

Chair Ray voiced concerns about timeshare solicitors.

Commissioner Dingwall asked about room sharing outside of Districts 7 and 9. Mr. Hess explained that the request only applies to Districts 7 and 9, and room sharing with other districts would require a Zoning Text Amendment.

Commissioner Fuhrman voiced concerns about splitting of ownership and Master Plan development. Mr. Hess stated that such issues should be addressed at the project level.

A MOTION WAS MADE BY LIVENGOOD, SECONDED BY SCANDURA, TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT NO. 03-03 BY APPROVING THE DRAFT RESOLUTION AND FORWARD TO THE CITY COUNCIL FOR ADOPTION; APPROVE ZONING TEXT AMENDMENT NO. 03-03 WITH FINDINGS AND MODIFICATIONS BY APPROVING THE DRAFT ORDINANCES AND FORWARD TO THE CITY COUNCIL FOR ADOPTION; AND, APPROVE LOCAL COASTAL PROGRAM NO. 03-02 WITH FINDINGS BY APPROVING THE DRAFT RESOLUTION AND FORWARD TO THE CITY COUNCIL FOR ADOPTION, BY THE FOLLOWING VOTE:

AYES: Scandura, Ray, Livengood, Burnett, Fuhrman
NOES: Dingwall
ABSENT: Dwyer
ABSTAIN: None

MOTION APPROVED

C. CONSENT CALENDAR – No items scheduled.

D. NON-PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS – No items scheduled.

E. PLANNING COMMISSION ITEMS

E-1. PLANNING COMMISSION REQUEST ITEMS – No items scheduled.

E-2. PLANNING COMMISSION COMMENTS

Commissioner Dwyer – Absent.

Commissioner Scandura – stated that he was proud of the hotel development in the City, but identified a need to diversify the City's stock in hotel rooms by encouraging development of more moderately priced hotels for families, senior citizens and business travelers. He voiced concerns about competing with neighboring coastal communities to attract high scale hotels and suggested that the City pay attention to quality, mid-priced hotels such as Embassy Suites, Homewood Suites, etc.

Commissioner Dingwall – None.

Commissioner Ray – thanked the Commission and staff for a great discussion. He discussed public hearing procedure and guidelines within Robert's Rules of Order, including the proper way to make an amendment, calling for a vote, objecting to a call for a vote, asking questions, and the number of amendments allowable for a motion on the floor. He also stressed the importance of Commissioner's using the call button when they wish to be recognized by the Chair.

Commissioner Livengood – requested that staff provide a status report on the residential development at Ellis Avenue and Beach Blvd. Staff responded that an update on the project is provided in the City Administrator's Newsletter and will be forwarded to the Commission.

Commissioner Burnett – stated that she was pleased with timeshare opportunities in the City.

Commissioner Fuhrman – referred to Robert's Rules of Order and the voting process, voicing concerns about final action being taken on Public Hearing Item No. 2 (timeshares within the Downtown Specific Plan) without considering certain amendments to the request discussed during the hearing. He also voiced concerns about late delivery of the staff report and how certain information provided within it raised questions related to the City's hotel base. He appreciated the Commission looking at new ideas and staying focused during the timeshare discussion.

F. PLANNING ITEMS

F-1. CITY COUNCIL ACTIONS FROM PREVIOUS MEETING

Scott Hess, Planning Manager – reported that no Planning Department items were heard before the City Council on February 7, 2005.

F-2. CITY COUNCIL ITEMS FOR THE NEXT MEETING

Scott Hess, Planning Manager – reported on the Planning Department items scheduled before the City Council on February 22, 2005.

F-3. PLANNING COMMISSION ITEMS FOR NEXT MEETING

Herb Fauland, Principal Planner – reminded the Commission that the regular meeting of February 23, 2005 has been cancelled, and reported on the items scheduled for March 8, 2005.

ADJOURNMENT: Adjourned at 10:00 p.m. to the next regularly scheduled meeting of March 8, 2005. The February 23, 2005 meeting has been canceled.

APPROVED BY:

Howard Zelefsky, Secretary

Steve Ray, Chair